



1 On May 23, 2001, Appellant appealed WWU's decision to the Department of Personnel. The  
2 Director's designee, Tammy Tee, conducted an allocation review of Appellant's position and  
3 forwarded the results of her review to Teri Thompson, Director of Classification and Compensation.  
4 By letter dated October 19, 2001, Ms. Thompson notified Appellant that her position was properly  
5 allocated to the Program Manager A classification. On November 15, 2001, Appellant filed  
6 exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant asked that  
7 her position be reallocated to the Computer Services Consultant classification. Appellant's  
8 exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

9  
10 Appellant works in the registration and information division of WWU's Registrar's Office.  
11 Appellant is responsible for providing information, training, and problem resolution for staff using  
12 the student information module of the Banner Student Information System. The Banner system is a  
13 computerized information system that consists of several modules. Various departments utilize the  
14 information in the system to extract information and run reports specific to their departments. The  
15 WWU Information Technology department is responsible for the overall system, while each  
16 department is responsible for the specific departmental use of the system. The Registrar's Office  
17 has a computer center that employs information technology staff to work with the system and assist  
18 users, such as Appellant. Appellant provides training to staff in using and writing reports and  
19 extracting information from the student module.

20 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that the Registration and Information  
21 division of the Registrar's office is a complex heterogeneous computing environment and that  
22 within this environment, she supervises the recording, manipulation and application of student  
23 information. Appellant contends that she is the primary trainer and provides the technical expertise  
24 and consulting for all users of student information on campus. Appellant contends that her duties  
25 cross multiple platforms and disciplines, that she is responsible for a broad range of information  
26

1 technology expertise, including developing training manuals and tools. Appellant argues that she  
2 works with multiple software applications and assists end-users with software applications  
3 including downloading and processing information. Appellant asserts that she writes "mini-  
4 software" programs for extracting information from the main program. Appellant contends that her  
5 duties and responsibilities are encompassed in the Computer Services Consultant class series and in  
6 the Information Technology Consultant class series and that her position should be reallocated.

7 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that the registration portion of the  
8 Banner system is only one part of the entire module and that other people are responsible for  
9 training for the other functions. Respondent contends that Appellant's position is supportive of the  
10 technical staff, that she provides information and training to users of the system to assist users in  
11 extracting information from the registration portion of the system. Respondent acknowledges that  
12 Appellant has a good understanding of how the Banner system works and that as the data expert in  
13 her area, she uses technical skills related to the registration portion of the system. However,  
14 Respondent asserts that Appellant is not a technical expert in how the system functions.  
15 Respondent argues that Appellant's position is best described by the Program Manager A  
16 classification.

17  
18 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position should be allocated  
19 to the Program Manager A classification should be affirmed.

20  
21 **Relevant Classifications.** Program Manager A, class code 2009; Computer Services Consultant I,  
22 class code 2345; and Information Technology Consultant Series, class codes 2395 - 2398.

23 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
24 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
25 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
26 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in

1 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
2 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
3 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
4 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

5  
6 Positions allocated to the Information Technology Consultant series are responsible for a broad  
7 range of information technology consulting expertise and assist users in applying information  
8 technology tools that cross multiple platforms and disciplines for an infrastructure consisting of  
9 multiple platform client/server and/or other host software applications delivered over complex  
10 networks. Appellant's position is limited in scope to providing training and technical assistance to  
11 users extracting data from the student registration portion of the Banner system. Appellant's  
12 position does not have the scope or breadth of expertise or responsibilities envisioned by the  
13 Information Technology Consultant class series.

14  
15 Positions allocated to the Computer Services Consultant series are applications specialists within an  
16 information services organization operating in a complex heterogeneous computing environment.  
17 Incumbents in these positions work directly with clients in defining application needs, designing  
18 system specifications, and applying various types of information systems to meet client/user needs.  
19 As stated above, Appellant's position is limited in scope to the student registration portion of the  
20 Banner system. She does not work in an information services organization as envisioned by this  
21 class series. Appellant assists clients in extracting information contained in the Banner system, she  
22 does not define application needs. Appellant does not design specifications for the Banner system  
23 and she does not assist users with various types of information systems. Appellant's position does  
24 not have the scope or breadth of expertise or responsibilities encompassed is the Computer Services  
25 Consultant class series.

1 Within the Registrar's office, Appellant manages a specialized function and critical aspects of the  
2 student registration process. Appellant utilizes unique knowledge and skills to operate and manage  
3 the student registration portion of the Banner system. Appellant provides limited application  
4 support services for users, including developing and providing training. Appellant is responsible  
5 for the daily operations of her program including project management; program management;  
6 public information; faculty, administrative, classified staff and student administration; and staff  
7 supervision. These duties and responsibilities fit within the Program Manager A classification.

8  
9 **Conclusion.** Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be denied and the determination of the  
10 Director, dated October 19, 2001, should be affirmed.

11 **ORDER**

12 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is  
13 denied and the Director's determination, dated October 19, 2001, is affirmed and adopted. A copy  
14 is attached.

15  
16 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2002.

17 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

18  
19  
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

21  
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
René Ewing, Member